



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,135	11/18/2005	Rob Van Der Giessen	066511.0111	2204
24735	7590	05/08/2007		
BAKER BOTTS LLP			EXAMINER	
C/O INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			MCCORMICK, MELENIE LEE	
THE WARNER, SUITE 1300				
1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2400			1655	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/08/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptocorrespondence@bakerbotts.com
oneka.davis@bakerbotts.com
darlene_hoskins31@msn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/533,135	VAN DER GIESSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Melenie McCormick	1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 31-61 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 31-37,39-54 and 56-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 55 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The previous notice of a non-responsive amendment has been vacated.

Applicants election of the species extract MWEL0700 from *Mucuna pruriens* seeds in the response filed 03/05/2007 has been acknowledged.

Claim 38 has been withdrawn.

Claims 31-37 and 39-61 are presented for examination on the merits.

Please note that the claims submitted 03/05/2007 indicate that the claims are new, but the preliminary amendment submitted 04/29/2005 provides the same claims as those submitted 03/05/2007, thus the claims are not new. In any subsequent communication, it is requested that applicant follow the procedure for proper claim status identifiers. For example, claims 31-37 and 39-61 are (previously presented).

Claim Objections

Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "phophatids" in line 4 is spelled incorrectly. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 41-45 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. These claims

merely state a functional intended use of the composition, but do not materially change the composition in any manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being for a composition comprising a *Mucuna pruriens* extract which may be effective in treating the particular disease Parkinson's disease, as well as other neurological diseases which are well known in the art to be treatable with L-dopa, does not reasonably provide enablement for a composition comprising a *Mucuna pruriens* extract which is effective in preventing and treating all neurological diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in

scope with these claims, as broadly claimed by Applicant.

The claims are directed to a pharmaceutical composition which comprises at least one *Mucuna pruriens* seed component, substance, fraction, or mixture thereof obtained therefrom and a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent, excipient or carrier, wherein the composition is operable to treat, prevent, or alleviate a neurological disease, wherein the neurological disease is a neurodegenerative disease, and wherein the neurodegenerative disease is selected from the group consisting of: Huntington's disease, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinsons disease and other diseases caused by exogenic factors, other diseases caused by endogenic factors, and any combination thereof.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (a) the breadth of the claims; (b) the nature of the invention; (c) the state of the prior art; (d) the level of one of ordinary skill in the art; (f) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (g) the existence of working examples; and (h) the quantity of experimentation added to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient number are discussed below so as to create a *prima facie* case.

While Applicant has reasonably demonstrated a pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one *Mucuna pruriens* seed component, substance, fraction, or mixture thereof obtained therefrom and a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent, excipient or carrier may enabling for treating particular neurological diseases (namely,

Parkinson's disease, as evidenced by the instant specification- see e.g. pages 31-32), Applicant has not demonstrated that such a pharmaceutical composition would be effective in preventing all neurological diseases. As evidenced by wikipedia.org, the term neurological disease encompasses numerous conditions (see e.g. pages 1-2), most of which Applicants have not demonstrated can be treated, prevented, or alleviated using a pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one *Mucuna pruriens* seed component, substance, fraction, or mixture thereof obtained therefrom and a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent, excipient or carrier.

Nowhere in the specification as originally filed does Applicant demonstrate the claim-designated effect of prevention of any of the instantly claimed/encompassed neurological disorders by the instantly claimed pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one *Mucuna pruriens* seed component, substance, fraction, or mixture thereof obtained therefrom and a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent, excipient or carrier. Thus, while the claim-designated composition may be useful in providing such an effect, Applicant does not disclose that such an effect is possible. The Office further notes that while the specification discloses that the claim-designated composition is useful in treating, preventing or alleviating neurological diseases, nowhere in the specification does Applicant disclose the administration of the instantly claimed composition to individuals afflicted with all of the diseases which are encompassed by the term "neurological diseases".

It should be noted that at the time of filing of the present application, the art of medicine did not recognize any significant treatments for Alzheimer's disease (which

would be one of the neurodegenerative and neurological diseases claimed and encompassed by the instant claims). As referenced by Vickers (Drugs Aging), at the time of filing of the instant application, there was (and still is) no effective treatment available to reverse, slow down, or prevent the course of Alzheimer's disease (see e.g. page 1, first para). Consequently, Applicants are not enabled for the prevention and treatment of any and all neurological diseases, including, for example, Alzheimer's diseases, as broadly claimed. Please note that the term "prevent" is an absolute definition which means to stop from occurring and, thus, requires a higher standard for enablement than does "treating", especially since it is notoriously well accepted in the medical art that the vast majority of afflictions/disorders suffered by mankind cannot be totally prevented with current therapies (other than certain vaccination regimes) - including preventing Alzheimer's disease (which clearly are not recognized in the medical art as being totally preventable).

Thus, while Applicant has demonstrated the instantly claimed composition may be useful in treating particular neurological diseases, specifically Parkinson's disease and other neurological diseases which are well known in the art to be treated with L-dopa, Applicants have not demonstrated that the instantly claimed pharmaceutical composition is effective at treating, alleviating, or preventing any and all neurological disorders (including, for example, Alzheimer's disease), as encompassed by the instant claims. Therefore, it would require undue experimentation without a reasonable expectation of success in order to determine if the instantly claimed composition would provide the claim-designated treatment, alleviation and prevention of the numerous

conditions instantly claimed and encompassed by the instant claims.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 37, 39 and claim 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear if claims 37 and 39 are attempting to define something different from claim 31. It is not clear if the composition in 39 is comprising the composition of claim 31 and further comprising something else, or if it is comprising the composition of claim 31. It is further unclear if claim 37 is attempting to add a distinct neurostimulatory or neuroprotective composition to the composition of claim 31, or if claim 37 is merely indicating that claim 31 is a neurostimulatory or neuroprotective agent. The metes and bounds of the claims are not clearly defined.

Claim 61 recites the limitation "composition of claim 1" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, as claim 1 has been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

A pharmaceutical composition comprising at least one *Mucuna pruriens* seed component, substance, fraction, or mixture thereof obtained therefrom; and a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent, excipient or carrier is claimed.

Claims 31-32, 34-37, and 39-46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mahajani et al. (Phytotherapy Research).

Mahajani et al. teach a formulation (pharmaceutical composition) which is made from the seed powder of *Mucuna pruriens* (see e.g. abstract). Mahajani et al. further teach that the formulation is suspended in water (excipient) (see e.g. page 254 Materials and Methods). Mahajani et al. also disclose that the composition is formulated for oral use, as it was administered as an oral dose (see e.g. p. 254 Material and Methods). Because the composition taught by Mahajani et al. (inherently) contains L-Dopa (see. e.g. p. 254), it would inherently comprise a neurostimulatory or neuroprotective composition, be operable to regulate L-Dopa, treat or alleviate a neurological disease or neurodegenerative disease, including Parkinson's disease (see e.g. entire article). Applicants do not define a particular pharmaceutically effective amount of L-dopa present in the composition, therefore, any amount of L-dopa, including that in the composition taught by Mahajani et al. reads on such an amount.

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claims 31-32, 34-37, 39-45, 48-49, 51, 53-54 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tripathi et al. (Phytotherapy Research).

Tripathi et al. teach a method of extracting *Mucuna pruriens* seeds with ethanol and then adding the extract to a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (water and tween) (see e.g. p. 534-535- Preparation of alcohol extract). This method reads on the instantly claimed method of preparing a *Mucuna pruriens* containing pharmaceutical composition by extracting *Mucuna pruriens* seed with ethanol and adding a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. This also reads on fractionated extraction, as broadly claimed, because Tripathi et al. extract dried seeds with ethanol and then transfer them to dessicator to be dried (see e.g. page 534 –Materials and Methods). Thus, the ethanol is removed and only a fraction of the original extraction mixture remains. Tripathi et al. further teach that powder obtained from *Mucuna pruriens* seeds contains L-dopa therein (see e.g. page 534-Introduction) and Applicants disclose that ethanol extracted pulverized (powdered) *Mucuna pruriens* seeds contain L-dopa (see e.g. -Specification p. 48). Because L-dopa is an amino acid, the seed powder composition taught by Tripathi et al. reads on the instantly claimed invention drawn to a one seed substance, pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, and an amino acid. Tripathi et al. further teach that the composition is orally administered, and is therefore in an orally administrable form, as instantly claimed (see e.g. page 535- *In vivo* experiments). Because L-dopa is present in *Mucuna pruriens* seed powder, the composition taught by Tripathi et al. would contain a neurostimulatory composition, as instantly claimed. This

composition would inherently provide the instantly claimed functional effects, including treatment of a neurological or neurodegenerative disease such as Parkinsons disease. In addition, please note that it is expected that the pharmaceutical composition taught by Tripathi et al. would contain the *Mucuna pruriens* extract MWEL0700, since this is a powder extract obtained by a water and ethanol extraction and the composition taught by Tripathi et al. is a powder obtained by ethanol extraction (see e.g. page 534 - Preparation of alcohol extract).

Therefore, the reference is deemed to anticipate the instant claims above.

Claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pruthi et al. (US 6,106,839).

Pruthi et al. teach a composition containing *Mucuna pruriens* (Cow-hage) (see e.g. col 2, lines 22-23). Pruthi et al. further teach that the composition is prepared (extracted) from the seeds of *Mucuna pruriens* using water (polar solvent) (see e.g. col 2, lines 37-38). Pruthi et al. also disclose that the composition is added to a syrup, which reads on the pharmaceutically acceptable excipient as instantly claimed (see e.g. claim 5). Pruthi et al. also disclose that the extract is in the form of a powder (see e.g. col 2, lines 40-41) and that powder is administered to a patient and is in powder form, tablets or capsules (see e.g. col 3, lines 1-3 and claims 3-4). This reads on the instantly claimed composition which is formulated for oral application or an orally administrable form. The composition taught by Pruthi et al. would intrinsically comprise a

neurostimulatory or neuroprotective composition as instantly claimed, as *Mucuna pruriens* is a known treatment for such neurodegenerative diseases as Parkinson's disease and *Mucuna pruriens* seed water extract inherently contains L-Dopa (see e.g. Mahajani et al.). Since L-dopa is an amino acid, the composition taught by Pruthi et al., then, contains an amino acid, as instantly claimed. As evidenced by Tripathi et al., at least four alkaloids have been isolated from *Mucuna pruriens* seed extracts (see e.g. page 534 –Introduction). Therefore, a water seed extract, such as that taught by Pruthi et al., would intrinsically contain these alkaloids therein. Pruthi et al. further beneficially teach that the *Mucuna pruriens* composition contains additional herbal extracts, such as *Piper longum* and *Zingiber officinalis*, which are known to have medicinal/therapeutic qualities and would read on the at least one additional pharmaceutically active agent as instantly claimed (see e.g. col 2,lines 29-36). Applicants do not define the particular amount which constitutes a pharmaceutically effective amount of L-dopa, therefore, the extract composition beneficially taught by Pruthi et al. reads on the pharmaceutical composition wherein the *Mucuna pruriens* seed component, substance, fraction, or mixture thereof does not contain a pharmaceutically effective amount of L-dopa, as instantly claimed.

Claims 41-45 do not materially change the composition, but rather merely impart an intended use to the composition. Because claims 41-45 do not materially change the composition, it is deemed that these claims are anticipated by the reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 31-37, 39-45, 48-49, 51, 53-54 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Tripathi et al. (Phytotherapy Research).

Tripathi et al. beneficially teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising a *Mucuna pruriens* seed extract and a method of preparing the composition and is relied upon for the reasons set forth above.

In addition to the previously cited teachings, Tripathi et al. also discloses that *Mucuna pruriens* extract is rich in fatty content (see e.g. page 534 –Introduction).

Tripathi et al. does not explicitly teach that the composition is added to a container to form a kit. Tripathi et al. also does not explicitly teach that that the extract composition contains at least one bipolar lipophilic molecule.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add the *Mucuna pruriens* extract composition beneficially taught by Tripathi et al. to a kit which comprises a container, as instantly claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made

would have been motivated and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so based upon the well known practice of adding therapeutic compositions to containers to improve their shelf life. In addition, since Tripathi et al. teaches that fats are present in *Mucuna pruriens* seed extracts and the extract was obtained through ethanolic extraction, the extract would intrinsically contain fats therein. These fats would necessarily be phospholipids (which are bi-polar fat molecules having a polar end and a non-polar end). This is true because typical fats are totally hydrophobic and would not have been extracted with a polar solvent such as ethanol. Furthermore, Phospholipids are 'lipophilic' in that the hydrocarbon tails are lipophilic, although the phosphate 'head' is hydrophilic. Thus, phospholipids read on bipolar lipophilic molecules, as instantly claimed. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made would have expected a bipolar lipophilic molecule (phospholipids) to be present in an ethanolic extract of *Mucuna pruriens* seeds, as instantly claimed.

Claims 31-32, 34-37, 39-46, 48, 50, 52, 54, and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Mahajani et al. (Phytotherapy Research). and Damodaran et al. (Biochemistry).

Mahajani et al. beneficially teach that extracts of *Mucuna pruriens* contain L-Dopa and are an effective treatment for individuals suffering from neurodegenerative diseases such as Parkinson's disease and is relied upon for the reasons set forth

above. Mahajani et al. do not teach a method of extracting *Mucuna pruriens* seeds which comprises using CO₂, or at least two solvents.

Damodaran et al. beneficially teach a method of extracting L-dopa from the seeds of velvet bean, which is, as readily admitted by applicants, another name for the seed of *Mucuna pruriens* (see e.g. p. 4-instant specification). Damodaran et al. further beneficially teach that the extract is obtained using water containing acetic acid and SO₂ and then using ammonia for further extraction, which would read on the at least two solvents as instantly claimed (see e.g. p. 2150-*/isolation of "dopa"*). It is further disclosed by Damodaran et al. that the extraction is performed using CO₂ (see e.g. p. 2150- */isolation of "dopa"*). Damodaran et al. also beneficially teach that the extract is dissolved (solubilized) in water (see e.g. 2151, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to follow the method beneficially taught by Damodaran et al. to prepare a composition by extracting seeds of *Mucuna pruriens* using at least two solvents and CO₂ because it is clear from Damodaran et al. that this has been previously employed for the purpose of obtaining L-dopa. It would have further been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the extract composition to a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier/diluent/excipient. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in doing so based upon the disclosure of Mahajani et al. that extracts of *Mucuna pruriens* contain L-Dopa and are an effective treatment for individuals suffering from neurodegenerative diseases such as Parkinson's disease. The adjustment of particular

conventional working conditions (e.g. the particular type of water (distilled) used to solubilize the extract) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Claims 31-37, 39-45, 48-49, 51, 53-54 and 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over and Tripathi et al. (Phytotherapy Research) in view of Majumdar et al. (Indian Pharmacist).

Tripathi et al. beneficially teach a method of extracting *Mucuna pruriens* seeds using ethanol and a pharmaceutical composition which is obtained using this method and is relied upon for the reasons set forth above.

Tripathy et al. do not teach wherein the extraction of *Mucuna pruriens* seeds is exhaustively extracted by the method as set forth in claim 56.

Mujumdar et al. beneficially teach a process of determining the presence of alkaloids in various extracts of *Mucuna pruriens* (see e.g. pp. 79-80). Mujumdar et al. teach that *Mucuna pruriens* was extracted with alcohol and the residue (retentate) was distilled under pressure, then successively digested (which reads on extracted at least two times) with alcohol. Mujumdar et al. further teach that the solvent is then removed and a residue is obtained (which reads on filtering) and dried under vacuum (see e.g. page 81). This would read on the method instantly claimed, as Mujumdar et al. perform an alcoholic extraction followed by removal of the solvent (which reads on filtering) and then repeat it using the residue from the first extraction.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to repeat the extraction and filtration steps of Tripathy et al., and pool any extracts obtained from these steps and concentrate them in order to increase the yield of the desired extract component because in view of Mujumdar et al., this type of extraction protocol was a conventional means for extracting *Mucuna pruriens* in order to increase the yield of active components.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 55 is free of the prior art, but is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Claims 55 is free of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melenie McCormick whose telephone number is (571) 272-8037. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



PATRICIA LEITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER